

The appeal of the murals is enhanced by the clever design of this book, which features Darryl Jones's color photographs. Traveling around the state with an old-fashioned panoramic view camera, Jones teetered on ladders, struggled with architectural obstacles, and prayed for sunny days. He photographed most of the murals in daylight to capture them as they appear to visitors today. The resulting color plates are truthfully dingy, and they make a valuable addition to the book's documentary mission. Both Carlisle and Jones remarked that their work drew the attention of post office visitors who would admit that they had never noticed the murals before. This book should awaken others to see them as well, visit them in person, and appreciate the social, cultural, and economic benefits that flow from government support of the arts.

KATHLEEN A. FOSTER is curator of nineteenth- and twentieth-century art at the Indiana University Art Museum, Bloomington. She has two books forthcoming in 1997: *Thomas Eakins Rediscovered* and *Captain Watson's Travels in America*.

A Home of Another Kind: One Chicago Orphanage and the Tangle of Child Welfare. By Kenneth Cmiel. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995. Pp. viii, 243. Illustrations, notes, tables, index. \$24.95.)

A commissioned history of an orphanage seems to promise a dull read, but Kenneth Cmiel has used the voluminous records of the Chicago Nursery and Half-Orphan Asylum to illuminate the history of child welfare in Chicago over a hundred-year period in a well-written study that has much wider implications for social welfare history than the story of a single institution.

The orphanage was founded around 1860 and by 1880 housed one hundred children, all aged less than ten years. Children were generally admitted because of family crisis; they were often brought in by a mother and stayed an average of two years. Thus, in its first five decades the orphanage served "dependent" not delinquent children. It was an institution for the working poor founded and closely managed by upper-class matrons, the wives of Chicago's business, legal, and medical elites. Chartered by the state in 1865, the orphanage was privately run and funded until the 1960s. It began excluding black children after World War I but readmitted them in the 1960s.

The traditional, custodial orphanage was put on the defensive by Progressive-era child welfare innovations such as the juvenile court and the "cottage homes" idea; nevertheless, the orphanage survived with little change until the 1920s and 1930s, decades Cmiel calls "the end of the nineteenth century." The home was still nominally managed by elite women, but these suburban matrons now lacked the confidence of the nineteenth-century managers (often their

own mothers and grandmothers) and sought the advice of professionals on admissions and policy. In 1949, Chapin Hall, as it was now called, entered a city-wide federation of private social service agencies.

From this point on, Cmiel tells a story of decline and fall. The sense of loss and irony is particularly evident in his account of what he calls “the unravelling”—the period after 1963 during which Chapin Hall was first the beneficiary of state and then federal funding, then suddenly in 1984 was closed down in the name of “deinstitutionalization” by reformers who condemned as Victorian an institution that was in fact a fully funded, modern treatment center serving as a therapeutic center for troubled youth.

Cmiel provides a useful corrective to social welfare history narratives of “a progressive elite ousting a Victorian elite” at the turn of the century (p. 207). His assertion that “conservative institutions” like Chapin Hall far outnumbered “cutting-edge institutions” like Hull House (p. 204) confirms other recent scholarship on Progressive-era social welfare. Private associations to oversee and coordinate public and private charities, notably the Charity Organization Society (COS), also predated the better-known 1920s initiatives. Rationalized, bureaucratic social welfare emerged in the gilded age and was led by reformers experienced in the Civil War era’s United States Sanitary Commission. In Chicago, the Associated Charities, not the settlements, provide the prehistory for twentieth-century social-work federation and bureaucratization, including the important medical-social model of casework. The settlements, which turned social welfare inside out, putting the reformers inside and leaving the clients on the outside, were, in contrast, a kind of anti-institution.

Cmiel’s sympathetic account of the pre-1945 orphanage reflects in part the strengths and weaknesses of his sources. These sources document the intentions of managers and professionals but rarely the experiences of children, even when he supplements them after 1957 with psychiatric social-work case records.

The author sidesteps some opportunities to criticize the orphanage. For example, what are we to make of Chapin Hall’s 1870s “industrial training system” that produced a division of labor where the girls darned “the socks of the asylum” (p. 24) while the boys were allowed to find part-time work, presumably paid? This and other clues to the orphanage’s internal organization and conservative ideology go largely unexplored in a study that focuses mainly on its external relations with private social welfare providers and public regulatory agencies. Ellis Hawley’s theory of an associative state provides a useful framework for Cmiel’s case study: the drama comes from the rise of private associations, from the story of how “institutions without any ongoing accountability to the public [wound up] . . . regulating agencies like Chapin Hall” (p. 83). Cmiel’s well-writ-

ten study makes a contribution to the scholarship on the history of the private sector and voluntarism. Since it is also a story that resonates with 1990s Republican plans to turn over social services to state and local elites and to replace entitlements with private charities, it is even more to Cmiel's credit that he makes a reader raised on Charles Dickens's *Hard Times* feel a little sad at the demise of Chapin Hall.

RUTH CROCKER is associate professor of history at Auburn University and the author of *Social Work and Social Order: The Settlement Movement in Two Industrial Cities, 1889–1930* (1992).

Organizing the Unemployed: Community and Union Activists in the Industrial Heartland. By James J. Lorence. (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1996. Pp. xx, 407. Map, illustrations, tables, notes, bibliography, index. Paperbound, \$22.95.)

In this "exhaustive analysis of the Michigan unemployed movement in all its phases and expressions" (p. xiii), James J. Lorence provides scholars of the depression era, labor, and the left with a well-researched, institutionally focused history of organizations of the unemployed in Michigan with special attention to the state's industrial centers. Through extensive research in archival collections, the papers of private organizations, newspapers, government documents, and secondary sources, Lorence documents developments in the unemployed movement in Michigan and links them to changes in the Congress of Industrial Organizations (CIO), the Workers' Alliance of America, and the national economy.

The Unemployed Councils, which joined with the Workers' Alliance in 1936 and took the Workers' Alliance's name, dominated Michigan's unemployed movement through the time of the formation of the CIO. From 1930 to 1933, Communist-initiated councils effectively led demonstrations, marches, and protests, the councils finding most success in Wayne County. Throughout the 1930s, councils and the Workers' Alliance succeeded in leading and participating in struggles for unemployed workers in the Upper Peninsula of Michigan where, for example, in Gogebic County the Workers' Alliance remained the voice for organized workers as late as 1938. In the late 1930s, the Workers' Alliance joined forces with other organizations of the unemployed and with the CIO's growing industrial union movement. Even in the areas most taken with the United Auto Workers' (UAW) programs for the unemployed, the Workers' Alliance consistently helped organize non-unionized workers.

By 1937, however, most workers in Michigan's auto-heavy industrial regions turned to the UAW, which had become a major organizer of Michigan's unemployed. Lorence argues that by joining